

REMARKS

The Office Action dated February 1, 2008 has been received and considered. In this response, claims 70, 75, 77, 78, 80-88, 93, 95-99, and 101 have been amended and claims 76, 79, and 94 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Support for the new claims may be found at, *inter alia*, FIGS. 6-10 and p. 14, line 27 – p. 20, line. 23 of the specification as originally filed. Reconsideration of the outstanding rejections in the present application is respectfully requested based on the following remarks.

Rejections of Claims 70-101

At page 2 of the Office Action, claims 70-77, 79-95, 87-95, and 97-101 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Porter (U.S. Patent No. 5,864,682). At page 12 of the Office Action, claims 78, 86, and 96 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable in view of Porter. These rejections are respectfully traversed with amendment.

Claim 70 has been amended and presently recites the features of:

generating, at a video server, a frame index for a video stream, the frame index comprising a plurality of frame index entries corresponding to a plurality of frames of the video stream, *wherein a first set of frames of the plurality of frames is to be displayed prior to a second set of frames of the plurality of frames in a forward presentation of the video stream;*

receiving, at the video server, a first presentation request for the video stream from a display client via a network, the video server remote to the display client, *the first presentation request comprising a request for reverse playback;*

determining, at the video server, a first subset of frames of the first set and a second subset of the frames of the second set based on the frame index in response to the first presentation request, *the first subset comprising an intra-coded frame and at least one forward-predicted frame of the first set of frames and the second subset comprising an intra-coded frame and at least one forward-predicted frame of the second set of frames;*

transmitting the second subset of frames to the display client via the network; and

transmitting the first subset of frames to the display client via the network *subsequent to transmitting the second subset of frames*.

Independent claim 88 also has been amended to recite similar features as those now recited by claim 70.

Porter fails to disclose or even suggest transmitting a first subset of frames of a first set of frames to a display client *subsequent to* transmitting a second subset of frames of a second set of frames in response to a request for reverse playback, whereby the first set of frames is to be displayed *prior to* the second set of frames in a forward presentation of the video stream, and whereby the first subset comprises an intra-coded frame and at least one forward-predicted frame of the first set and the second subset comprises an intra-coded frame and at least one forward-predicted frame of the second set as provided by claims 70 and 88. Rather, Porter teaches

Rewind operations are performed in the same manner as fast and slow forward operations with the exception that ***only I-frames are selected for rewind operations (regardless of whether the rewind operations are fast or slow). P and B frames are automatically skipped*** because they cannot be decoded unless frames that precede them in the original MPEG file are processed before them. However, during rewind operations, the frames on which P and B frames depend will be processed after the P and B frames that depend on them.

Porter, col. 20, line 61 to col. 21, line 3 (emphasis added). Thus, in contrast with claims 70 and 88, Porter teaches that only intra-coded frames (“I-frames”) are “selected for rewind operations” and thus only I-frames (but not forward-predicted frames (“P-frames”) or even bi-predicted frames (“B-frames”) are transmitted to a display client by the system of Porter during a “rewind operation” (i.e., reverse playback). Accordingly, Porter fails to disclose or suggest each and every feature presently recited by claims 70 or 88, as well as the particular combinations of feature recited by claims dependent from one of claim 70 or claim 88 at least by virtue of this dependency.

Independent claim 84 has been similarly amended and presently recites the features of:
 receiving, at a display client, user input indicating *a requested reverse playback* of a
 video stream having a plurality of frames;
 generating, at the display client, a presentation request based on the user input;

transmitting the presentation request from the display client to a video server via a network, the video server remote the display client;

receiving, at the display client, a second subset of frames from the video server via the network, the second subset of frames including an intra-coded frame *and at least one forward-predicted frame* of a second set of frames of the video stream;

receiving, at the display client, a first subset of frames from the video server via the network *subsequent to receiving the second subset of frames*, the first subset of frames including an intra-coded frame *and at least one forward-predicted frame* of a first set of frames of the video stream, *the first set of frames intended to be displayed prior to the second set of frames for a forward presentation of the video stream*;

processing, at the display client, the second subset of frames for display in; and

processing, at the display client, the first subset of frames for display *subsequent to the second subset*.

As discussed above, Porter teaches transmitting only I-frames during a “rewind operation” (i.e., reverse playback) and therefore fails to disclose or suggest that a display client receives at least one forward-predicted frame of a first set and at least one forward-predicted frame of a second set in response to transmitting a presentation request based on a requested reverse playback as provided by claim 84. Porter therefore fails to disclose or suggest each and every feature recited by claim 84, as well as the particular combinations of feature recited by claims dependent from claim 84 at least by virtue of this dependency.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of claims 70-77, 79-95, 87-95, and 97-101 and the obviousness rejection of claims 78, 86, and 96 is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

The Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance, and an early indication of the same is courteously solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone at the below listed telephone number in order to expedite resolution of any issues and to expedite passage of the present

application to issue, if any comments, questions, or suggestions arise in connection with the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 50-1835.

Respectfully submitted,

/Ryan S. Davidson/

Ryan S. Davidson, Reg. No. 51,596

LARSON NEWMAN ABEL POLANSKY & WHITE, LLP

5914 West Courtyard Drive, Suite 200

Austin, Texas 78730

(512) 439-7100 (phone) (512) 439-7199 (fax)

June 2, 2008

Date